

BYZANTINISCHE ZEITSCHRIFT

UNTER MITWIRKUNG ZAHLREICHER FACHGENOSSEN

MIT UNTERSTÜTZUNG DES THERIANOSFONDS
DER KÖNIGL. BAYERISCHEN AKADEMIE DER WISSENSCHAFTEN

HERAUSGEGEBEN VON

KARL KRUMBACHER
O. Ö. PROFESSOR AN DER UNIVERSITÄT ZU MÜNCHEN

ELFTER BAND. JAHRGANG 1902.

MIT 3 TAFELN.



LEIPZIG,
DRUCK UND VERLAG VON B. G. TEUBNER.
1902.

Inhalt des elften Bandes.

I. Abtheilung.

	Seite
Zu Chorikios. Von Karl Praechter	1
Die Chronik vom Jahre 1570. („Dorotheos“ von Monembasia und Manuel Malaxos.) Von Theodor Preger	4
Zu den Briefen des Theodoros Laskaris. Von P. N. Papageorgiu	16
Zu Photios. Von P. N. Papageorgiu	33
Nachtrag zu B. Z. X 151. Von P. N. Papageorgiu	34
Note sur la date de la mort de S. Jean Climaque. Par F. Nau	35
Νικηφόρος Κάλλιστος Ξανθόπουλος. Ἐπὶ Ἀ. Παπαδοπούλου-Κεραμέως	38
Μάρκος ὁ Εὐγενικός ὡς πατὴρ ἅγιος τῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας. Ἐπὶ Ἀ. Παπαδοπούλου-Κεραμέως	50
Zu den Dokumenten des Gottesmutter-Klosters in Makedonien. Von P. N. Papageorgiu	70
Συνοδικὴ πρᾶξις Γεωργίου Ξιφιλίνου. Ἐπὶ Ἀ. Παπαδοπούλου-Κεραμέως	74
Διορθώσεις εἰς Fontes historiae imperii Trapezuntini, I. Ἐπὶ Π. Ν. Παπαγεωργίου	79
Ἀπὸ τοῦ βασιλικοῦ σκεπέτου? Ἐπὶ Π. Ν. Παπαγεωργίου	103
Di un nuovo palinsesto dei Basilici. Da C. Ferrini	105
Ἀντίβολον = archetypus. Von P. N. Papageorgiu	109
Von Saloniki „nach Europa“, von Europa „nach Griechenland“. Von P. N. Papageorgiu	109
Zu B. Z. VII 587. Von P. N. Papageorgiu	110
Ἀμφότεροι for πάντες. By J. B. Bury	111
Ο ΟΞΤΡΥΓΧΟΣ ΧΑΡΑΚΤΗΡ. Von V. Gardthausen	112
Angebliche Maler und Mosaikarbeiter auf dem Athos im IX. und X. Jahrhundert. Von P. N. Papageorgiu	118
Die Königin von Saba in den byzantinischen Chroniken. Von Samuel Kraufs	120
Κεκανραϊκὸν δημοτικὸν ποίημα. Ἐπὶ Π. Ν. Ζεζιέρτου	132
Der Friede zu Adrianopel (Februar 1190). Von K. Zimmert	303
Noch einmal der litterarische Nachlaß Carl Hopfs. Von E. Gerland	321
Autour de Chalcedoine. Par J. Pargoire	333
Office inédit de Saint Romain le Mélode. Par S. Pétridès	358
Neun Ethika des Evangelienkommentars von Theodor Meliteniotes und deren Quellen. Von Sebastian Haidacher	370
Sur diverses citations, et notamment sur trois passages de Malalas retrouvés dans un texte hagiographique. Par J. Bidez	388

	Seite
The Relation of the Paschal Chronicle to Malalas. By F. C. Conybeare . .	395
Eugenios von Palermo. Von Leo Sternbach	406
Ὁ ἐπιθαλάμιος ἄνδρονίκου II, τοῦ Παλαιολόγου. Ἐπὶ Σ. Παπαδημητρίου	452
Notes on Fable Incunabula containing the Planudean Life of Aesop. By George C. Keidel	461
Zu den byzantinischen Angaben über den altiranischen Kalender. Von Louis H. Gray.	468
Die Ruine von Philippi. (Mit 3 Tafeln.) Von J. Strzygowski	473
Ναξία νήσος καὶ πόλις. Ἐπὶ Περικλέους Γ. Ζεφλέρτου	491
Nachtrag zu den lateinisch-romanischen Lehnwörtern im Neugriechischen. Von Karl Dieterich	500
Rhythmisches zu der Kunstprosa des Konstantinos Manasses. Von Paul Maas	505
Saint Jérôme et la Vie de Paul de Thèbes. Par M. A. Kugener.	513
Ἡ ἐκ τῆς Terra d'Otranto ἐπιγραφή. Ἐπὶ Ἀ. Παπαδοπούλου-Κεραμέως	518
Ἐπαρχικοῦ καὶ οὐχὶ βασιλικοῦ. Ἐπὶ Ἀ. Παπαδοπούλου-Κεραμέως . .	520
Zur Bedeutungsgeschichte des Wortes τραγουνῶ. Von K. Krumbacher. . .	523

II. Abteilung.

Ernestus Maass, Commentariorum in Aratum reliquiae. Besprochen von Franz Boll	135
G. Kroll et A. Olivieri, Catalogus codicum astrologorum graecorum. Be- sprochen von Franz Boll	139
Wilhelm Greif, Neue Untersuchungen zur Dictys- und Daresfrage. I. Dictys Cretensis bei den Byzantinern. Besprochen von Edwin Patzig.	144
J. Fürst, Untersuchungen zur Ephemeris des Diktys von Kreta. Be- sprochen von Edwin Patzig	157
Leo Sternbach, Studia philologica in Georgium Pisidam. Besprochen von Isidor Hilberg.	160
E. Maafs, Analecta sacra et profana. Besprochen von Theodor Preger . .	164
Franz Diekamp, Hippolytos von Theben. Besprochen von A. Ehrhard . .	168
Ernst von Dobschütz, Christusbilder. Besprochen von A. Ehrhard . . .	170
K. Holl, Enthusiasmus und Bußgewalt beim griechischen Mönchtum. Be- sprochen von A. Ehrhard.	178
Josef Schmidt, Des Basilus aus Achrida, Erzbischofs von Thessalonich, bisher unedierte Dialoge. Besprochen von J. E. Weis.	183
A. Thumb, Die griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus.	
P. Kretschmer, Die Entstehung der Κοινή. Besprochen von Paul Wendland	184
Georg Swarzenski, Die Regensburger Buchmalerei des X. und XI. Jahr- hunderts. Besprochen von J. Strzygowski.	191
A. Venturi, Storia dell' arte italiana. Besprochen von J. Strzygowski . .	194
Jahrbuch der Historisch-Philologischen Gesellschaft bei der Kaiserl. Neurussischen Universität (zu Odessa). VIII. u. IX. Byz. Abt., Bd. V u. VI. Besprochen von Ed. Kurtz	196
Jean Lombard, Byzance. Préface de Paul Margueritte. Besprochen von Theodor Zichy	202
Heinrich Hagenmeyer, Epistulae et chartae historiam primi belli sacri spectantes quae supersunt aevo aequales ac genuinae. Besprochen von R. Rühricht.	524

The Relation of the Paschal Chronicle to Malalas.

In the following note I shall prove, with the unexpected aid of the old Armenian history attributed to Moses of Khorene, that the Paschal Chronicle is not, in respect of the matter it has in common with Malalas, a transcript, as usually supposed, of that author. I shall demonstrate that Malalas and the Chronicle used common sources, and used them independently.

Chron. Pasch. Ed. Bonn.
p. 561, l. 6:

Θεοδόσιος ὁ βασι-
λεὺς . . .

l. 8. τοὺς δὲ ναοὺς
τῶν Ἑλλήνων κατέστρε-
ψεν ἕως ἐδάφους.

Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ αὐτίδι-
μος βασιλεύσας τὰ ἱερὰ
μόνον ἐκλείσεν.

p. 561, l. 11:
καὶ κατέλυσεν

p. 561, l. 14:

ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὸ
ἱερὸν Δαμασκοῦ ἐπόλ-
ησεν ἐκκλησίαν χριστιαν-
ῶν

Moses Hist. Arm. 3, 33.

Et sumit coronam
Theodosius.

Is destruxit templa
idolorum usque ad fun-
damentum,

[τὰ] clausa tantum a
sancto Constantino,

[τὸ] appellatum So-
lis,

et Artemidos,
et Aphrodites

in Byzantio.

Subversit pari modo
templum Damasci, et
fecit ecclesiam.

Malalas p. 344, l. 19:

τοὺς δὲ ναοὺς τῶν
Ἑλλήνων πάντα κατέ-
στρεψεν ἕως ἐδάφους
ὁ αὐτὸς Θεοδόσιος βα-
σιλεὺς.

p. 345, l. 12:

τοὺς τρεῖς ναοὺς τοὺς
ὄντας ἐν Κωνσταντινου-
πόλει . . . ἧτις αὐτὴ
κέκληται ἕως τοῦ νῦν
τοῦ Ἡλίου· τὸν δὲ
τῆς Ἀρτεμίδος ναὸν . . .
τὸν δὲ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης
ναὸν

p. 344, l. 22:

ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν
Δαμασκοῦ ἐποίησεν ἐκ-
κλησίαν χριστιανῶν.

p. 561, l. 12:		p. 344, l. 20:
καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν Ἑλίου-	Pari modo etiam	κατέλυσε δὲ καὶ τὸ
πόλεως	templum Elinoppidi,	ἱερὸν Ἑλίουπόλεως
τὸ τοῦ βαλανίου	[τὸ] Libani	
τὸ μέγα καὶ περιβόητον	[τὸ] magnum et celeberrimum	τὸ μέγα καὶ περιβόη-
τὸ τριλίθον.	[τὸ] ex tribus lapidibus.	τον τὸ λεγόμενον
		τριλίθον.

Notice how the Armenian text combines Malalas and the Chronicle together:

1) Malalas omits the statement that Constantine only shut up, instead of destroying, the temples; because he wrote in an age which refused to believe that Constantine was less fanatical than Theodosius.

The Armenian and the Chronicle retain this statement.

2) Malalas also omits the words τὸ τοῦ βαλανίου, a corrupt reading which the Armenian enables us to correct into τὸ τῆς Βαᾶλ τοῦ Λιβάνου.

The late Prof. Carrière, whose death is an irreparable loss to Armenian studies, has pointed out in his work on the Sources of Moses of Khoren that in the Corpus inscriptionum semiticarum there is an inscription mentioning a Baal of Lebanon, perhaps as early as the ninth century B. C.

3) On the other hand Malalas alone tells of the subversion of the three temples inside Constantinople, but in a context removed by two alien paragraphs from that in which the Armenian locates it. The Armenian context is the most natural. Having premised that Theodosius subverted the temples, which Constantine had only closed; he begins by adducing the three temples in the capital city as examples, and then passes by a natural sequence to the remoter parts of the empire, Damascus and Heliopolis. This entire section divorced by Malalas from its true context, and briefly summarised by the Armenian in its rightful place, is in the Paschal Chronicle altogether absent.

4) In placing the clause: Subversit pari etc. before that which begins: Pari modo etiam the Armenian inverts the order both of Malalas and of the chronicle.

It may be noticed that in the *Ἐκλογαὶ ἱστοριῶν* published by J. A. Cramer in 1839, from cod. 854 of the Paris Library, we find the same notice of Constantine which Malalas omits, as follows: οὗτος ὁ Θεοδοσίος, οὗς Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ μέγας τῶν Ἑλλήνων ναοὺς οὐ κατέλυσε, ἀλλὰ κλεισθῆναι μόνον προσέταξε, πάντας ἕως ἰδάφους κατέλυσε. And this seems to be the form of statement condensed in the Armenian.

There is but one supposition which covers the mutual relations, here disclosed, of these three texts; namely that they all three used, but independently of each other, a common source. The Armenian best preserves the original of the common source.

Book II, ch. 88, of this same Armenian history is, as Prof. Carrière has pointed out, a literal translation of the Greek text given in Malalas pp. 291, 292, and in Chron. Pasch., ed. Bonn pp. 494, 495, ed. Ducange p. 265. It is an enumeration of the constructions raised in Byzantium, first by Severus and afterwards by Constantine.

But here again the Armenian combines positive and negative features of both the Greek texts in a way which shews that it is taken from neither, as one sees in these examples:

1) Mal. τὸ μυστικὸν ὄνομα τοῦ ἡλίου.

Chr. P. τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ ἡλίου.

Armen. = 'mysticum nomen solis'.

2) Mal. ἐποίησε τὸ ἵππικόν . . . ὅπερ οὐκ ἐφθασε πληρῶσαι.

Chr. P. ἐποίησε τὸ ἵππικόν (and omit rest).

Armen. = 'and (he built) the hippodrome, but not completely'.

3) Mal. ἐκάλεσε τὸν τόπον στρατήγιον.

Chr. P. ἐκάλεσε τὸν τόπον στρατήγιν.

Armen. = 'the so-called stratigin'.

4) Mal. οἱ δὲ τῆς πόλεως Βύζης οὕτως ὠνόμαζον τὸ αὐτὸ δημόσιον.

Chr. P. οἱ δὲ τῆς πόλεως Βυζαντίων καὶ αὐτοὶ ὠνόμασαν τὸ αὐτὸ δημόσιον λουτρόν.

Armen. = 'cuius nomine appellaverunt balnea'.

Throughout this passage the Armenian text agrees best, on the whole, with Malalas; who copied the most faithfully the common source. Yet where Malalas seems to deflect from that source, as in reading *στρατήγιον* for *στρατήγιν*, and in omitting *λουτρόν*, the Armenian agrees with the Paschal chronicle.

Another example of the same rule is presented by Moses bk. II, ch. 79:

Chr. Pasch. ed. Bonn.	Moses:	Malalas
p. 509, l. 14:		p. 203, l. 16:
'Ρωμαίων λβ' ἐβασί-	Carus autem una cum	ἐβασίλευσεν ὁ θειό-
λευσεν Κᾱρος ἅμα τοῖς	filiis Carino et Nume-	τατος Κᾱρος . . .
υἱοῖς αὐτοῦ Καρίνῳ καὶ	riano regnavit	
Νουμεριανῷ ἔτη γ' . . .		
p. 510, l. 5:		l. 20:
Κατέφθασεν Καρίνος	et cum copias com-	ἐπιστράτευσε δὲ κατὰ

ὁ βασιλεὺς ἀπὼν πολε-
μῆσαι κατὰ Περσῶν μετὰ
τοῦ θείου αὐτοῦ Κάρου,

parasset proelium com-
misit contra Persarum
regem,

et victus

Romam rediit. Quare
plures nationes auxilio
adhibens Artashir, pro
adiumento utens deserto
Tačkastan, denuo proe-
lium commisit cum Ro-
manis rursus, cis Eu-
phraten et ultra,

ὅστις (? lege ὥστε)
Κάρου ἐκεραυνώθη ἐν
τῇ Μεσοποταμίᾳ. Καρ-
νός δὲ ἡττηθεὶς ἔφυγεν
εἰς Κάρρας τὴν πόλιν

unde occisus est Carus
in Yrhinōn. Pari modo
etiam Carinus, qui con-
tra Kornak abiit in de-
sertum,

una cum quo et Tiri-
dates.

καὶ παραφωσενύσαντες
οἱ Πέρσαι ἔλαβον, καὶ
εὐθέως αὐτὸν ἐφόνευ-
σαν.

Et obrutus est ille
et exercitus,
et reliqui in fugam
versi sunt.

p. 510, l. 16:

εἴτα σφάζεται Νου-
μεριανὸς ἐν Περὶνθῷ τῆς
Θράκης . . .

l. 18:

Ρωμαίων λγ' ἐβασί-
λευσεν Διοκλητιανός.

.
Iisdem diebus et occi-
sus est Numerianus in
Thracia, et per succes-
sionem habuit regnum
Diocletianus.

Περσῶν . . .

p. 303, l. 11:

καὶ κατέφθασεν ὁ
αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς Νου-
μεριανός, ἀπὼν πο-
λεμῆσαι κατὰ Περ-
σῶν . . .

καὶ εἰσελθὼν παρέ-
λαβε τὰ Περσικὰ μέρη

p. 302, l. 22:

καὶ ὑπέστρεψεν . . .

p. 303, l. 2:

ὑποστρέψας δὲ ἐν
Ρώμῃ

p. 303, l. 21:

καὶ ἐπεστράτευσεν (sc.
Numerianus) κατὰ Περ-
σῶν· ἐν τῷ δὲ συγκροῦ-
σαι αὐτὸν τὸν πόλεμον
ἐπετέθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ
Πέρσαι καὶ ἀνεΐλαν

p. 306, l. 7:

ἐν δὲ τῷ μέσῳ χρόνῳ
τοῦ πολέμου ὁ αὐτὸς
Καρῖνος τελευτᾷ ἰδίῳ
θανάτῳ . . .

p. 304, l. 1:

καὶ ἔφυγεν (sc. Nu-
merianus) ἐν Κάρραις
τῇ πόλει· καὶ φασσενύ-
σαντες οἱ Πέρσαι παρέ-
λαβον αὐτὸν αἰχμάλωτον
καὶ εὐθέως ἐφόνευσαν
αὐτόν.

p. 306, l. 9:

μετὰ δὲ τὴν βασιλείαν
Καρῖνου ἐβασίλευσε
Διοκλητιανός.

In the above the Armenian text and the Paschal Chronicle agree in the following points:

1) They both allege that Carus ruled together with his two sons. Here as elsewhere Malalas refuses to entertain the idea of two or three persons occupying the throne at once.

2) They both allege that Carus died through being struck by lightning. The *vox nihili* in the Armenian in *Yrhinon* is a transcription of *ἐν νεκρυνῶ*, which the translator took to be the name of the place in which Carus was slain (*ἐσφάγη*).

3) They both allege that Numerian was slain in Thrace, whereas Carinus perished in Persia. According to Malalas Numerian was slain by the Persians, and Carinus died a natural death.

4) They both allege that Diocletian succeeded Numerian. Not so Malalas.

Note also that whereas Malalas relates that Numerian — and the Chronicle that Carinus — was flayed and stuffed by the Persians, the Armenian writer, being better informed, tells the story of neither the one nor the other.

On the other hand the statement of the Armenian that Carus 'Romam rediit' finds an echo in Malalas' text. Malalas alone adds the absurd statements that Carus founded Carrhae and gave his name to Caria, which have no echo in the Chronicle or in the Armenian historian.

It is not likely that in these and other similar passages the Armenian historian was using more than one Greek source, which as elsewhere he amalgamates with Armenian *sagas*. That source cannot have been either Malalas or the Paschal Chronicle, but was a source used by them in common with him.

It is superfluous to adduce further examples of the use by the Armenian of a common source of Malalas and of the Paschal Chronicle. It is useful however to indicate the range of this source, and herein we are assisted by the research of the late Prof. A. Carrière.

The Armenian used this source in the following passages of his history.

Bk. II, ch. 13 = Malalas p. 155, l. 22—156 l. 1.

The Armenian names as his source Camadrus, and it is noticed by Carrière that like Malalas he cites the oracle thus: *Κροῖστος Ἄλυν ποταμὸν διαβὰς κ.τ.λ.*

Bk. II, ch. 79 = Chr. Pasch. ed. Bonn p. 509 = Malalas p. 302, 306. See above.

Bk. II, ch. 83 = Chr. Pasch. 516, ll. 17—19 and 517, ll. 6—7.

Bk. II, ch. 83 = Chr. Pasch. 520, ll. 15—20 = Malalas pp. 316, 317.

Bk. II, ch. 76 = Malalas pp. 301—302.

Bk. II, ch. 79 = Malalas p. 302.

Bk. II, ch. 87 = Malalas pp. 317 and 319.

Bk. II, ch. 88 = Chr. Pasch. pp. 494—495 = Malalas pp. 291—292.

Bk. II, ch. 88 = Chr. Pasch. 528, ll. 13—15 = Malalas p. 320.

Bk. III, ch. 12 = Malalas p. 325—326.

Bk. III, ch. 21 = Chr. Pasch. pp. 557—558 = Malalas p. 339.

Bk. III, ch. 29 = Chr. Pasch. pp. 560—561 = Malalas pp. 341—342.

Bk. III, ch. 33 = Malalas p. 343.

Rk. III, ch. 33 = Chr. Pasch. p. 561 = Malalas p. 344.

Bk. III, ch. 39 = Malalas p. 347.

Bk. III, ch. 41 = Malalas p. 348. This last passage is remarkable for the reason that the form Mizoulanum for Mediolanum found in Malalas' notice of the death of Theodosius seems also to underlie some of the Armenian Mss.

The document therefore used by the Armenian embraced the period from the death of the emperor Tacitus to the death of Theodosius, as Prof. Carrière has remarked. It was in most respects nearer to the text of Malalas than to that of the Paschal Chronicle. However it contained some things omitted in the former, notably the statement that Constantine was a bastard born of Helena out of wedlock. By the time of Malalas, orthodox readers did not wish to read such a story about the saint who found the cross. It is given in the Paschal Chronicle, of which the Armenian faithfully reproduces the text.

On the other hand although Malalas relates the baptism of Constantine by Sylvester of Rome, the Armenian does not appear to have found this legend in his common source, and accordingly takes it from the older Armenian version of the *Acta Sylvestri*. This version seems to have been made as early as the year 480, and was anyhow paraphrased, interpolated and cut down, as early as the year 676. In my recent article on the 'Date of the history of Moses of Khoren'¹⁾, I made the mistake of supposing that the first Armenian version of these acts belonged to the date 676, and that the paraphrase was indefinitely later. The reason of my error was that a colophon fixing the date of the paraphrase has strayed into the Jerusalem codex of the classical version.

From this classical version the author of the history attributed to Moses of Khoren borrows a description of Sylvester, and fits it on

1) Byz. Zeitschr. Bd. X, Heft 3—4.

to his master Mesrop; just as Eginhard went to Suetonius for a description of Charlemagne.

The importance of the Armenian text of Moses as a means of determining the relation of Malalas to the Paschal Chronicle is the same, whether it belongs to the fifth or to the eighth century. But the chief argument, on which Prof. Carrière relied for dating it as late as 700, was its supposed dependence on Malalas. This argument I have at least invalidated; and if the Armenian work is to be removed from its traditional date some sounder argument must be found for doing so.

Prof. Carrière shared in the common belief of Byzantine scholars that the Paschal Chronicle is, so far as it has common matter with Malalas, a mere transcript of Malalas. The evidence of the Armenian text in itself refutes this belief, and helps to confirm the statement of Ducange that Holstein had a *codex* of the Chronicle carried up as far only as the year 354.

Since Gelzer in his work upon Julius Africanus first cast suspicion upon the statement of Ducange, it has been believed, almost as a dogma, by Byzantine scholars 1) that Holstein invented his *codex* of the older form of the Paschal Chronicle, and 2) that the collation of that *codex* printed by Ducange in his commentary is a mere mystification. Prof. Mommsen has accordingly given the *coup de grâce* to Holstein in the following words (see his edition of the *Chronica minora*, Berol. 1881, tom. IX of the *Monumenta Germaniae historica*, p. 203): „Chronicon Paschale quod appellari solet . . . prodit anno, ut titulus ait, p. Chr. 630 Constantinopoli: nam quae fertur facta esse a. 354 editio prior, eam nullam esse viri docti hodie consentiunt.“

M. Delisle, the librarian of the Bibliothèque Nationale, had already four years before, as I have elsewhere pointed out (see the *Journal of Theological Studies*, London, Jan. 1901, vol. II, no. 6), exploded by anticipation any doubts of Holstein's good faith by his publication of the letters of the French scholar Bigot. In one of these letters addressed to Ducange, April 28, 1684 from Rouen we read as follows:

„Estant à Rome, M. Holstein me dit qu'il avait l'original de cette chronique, que l'abbate della Farina, Sicilien, avoit apporté de Sicile à Rome, que cet exemplaire avoit esté apporté à Messine par un marchande de Constantinople, et que ce chronique devoit estre appellé Chronicon Constantinopolitanum, ayant esté composé à Constantinople et par un citoyen de cette ville là, parceque l'auteur, parlant des affaires de cette ville là, il disoit *ἡμεῖς*, *nos*. Il se flattoit que un

certain (dont je ne me souviens plus du nom présentement, je l'ay indiqué à M. Thoinard) avoit escrit *Chronicon valde pium*, ce qu'il interpretoit de cette chronique, qui avoit esté composée principalement pour marquer les jours des Pasques, et que pour cet effect il avoit mis à la teste de sa chronique plusieurs extraits des anciens qui reguardoient la Pasque, qui se trouvent dans le ms. et non dans l'édition de Raderus. M. l'Abbé de la Farina presta ce ms. à M. Holstein, qui transcrivit ces traités qui sont au devant de cette chronique qui regardent la Pasque, et conféra une partie de la chronique. N'ayant pu achever à la conférer, me disant qu'il vouloit me bailler cet exemplaire pour porter en France, affin de le faire imprimer au Louvre comme faisant partie de l'histoire byzantine, j'entrepris cette collation et je l'achevé deux jours devant sa mort (Feb. 2, 1661). L'ayant achevée, je remis le Ms. entre les mains de l'aumosnier de M. Holstein, et je le prié de luy dire que j'avois achevé de conférer ce ms. que je lui renvoiois, et que je gardois son exemplaire pour le porter en France, affin que si M. Holstein mouroit et que l'on eust sceu que j'eusse eu cet exemplaire, on ne creust point que je le voulusse retenir et me l'approprier. M. Holstein dit à son aumosnier qu'il me prioit de le prendre, de le porter en France et de le faire imprimer au Louvre. Après la mort de M. Holstein, j'en parlé à M. le Cardinal Barberin, qui sçavoit bien que M. Holstein m'avoit confié cet exemplaire. L'original doit avoir esté mis dans la bibliothèque du Vatican: pour le moins, c'estoit l'intention de M. Holstein. S'il n'y est point, il doit estre dans celle de M. le Cardinal Barberin, qui estoit exécuteur du testament de M. Holstein et légataire universel. J'ai baillé à M. Thoinard cet exemplaire qui contient les diverses leçons du ms. grec, et de plus la correction de la traduction qu'avoit faite M. Holstein."

The translation here referred to was in Latin and destined by Holstein to replace the inaccurate version of Raderus. The *diverses leçons* are just those which Ducange printed as from the *codex Holsteinius*. It will not be my fault, if Prof. Mommsen and other scholars continue to believe that the codex thus collated by Holstein and Bigot, and used by Ducange, was a mystification on the part of Holstein of his contemporaries. It will also be the first step to a juster appreciation of the problem of the date of Malalas, for scholars to recognise that at any rate as far as the year 354 the Paschal Chronicle is a source independent of and long anterior to Malalas.

It is a point worthy of discussion whether the Paschal Chronicle in its earliest form, or any how, the document immediately underlying that form, may not have been the work of Andreas of Byzantium,

brother of Magnus the bishop, who compiled for Constantius a chronological work about the year 354, with a view to fixing the date of Easter. Of this Andreas, Dulaurier in his *Recherches sur la Chronologie arménienne*, Paris 1859, p. 47, writes thus:

„Ce n'est qu'en 353 que nous (sc. les Arméniens) voyons posséder, pour la première fois, un canon pascal qui avait été calculé pour un laps de 200 ans, et qui est appelé le canon bicentenaire d'André. Son auteur est qualifié par Açogh'ig, Jean Diacre, Jacques de Crimée et Guiragos de *Frère de l'évêque Magnus*. Il était originaire de Byzance, au dire de Jacques de Crimée. Guiragos ajoute que c'est par l'ordre de Constance II qu'il le composa. Le tableau de la page 36 nous montre que, dans la succession des évolutions du cycle décennovennal, ce canon concorde avec celui d'Anatolius et de l'Église alexandrine. C'est déjà une présomption qu'André n'avait fait qu'importer à Byzance le comput égyptien, et que, de Byzance, ce comput passa chez les Arméniens. Cette présomption sera confirmée par la comparaison que nous ferons bientôt de l'ennéadécatéride d'André et de celle des Alexandrius.“

The earliest of the Armenian writers here mentioned by Dulaurier, Açogh'ig or Asolnik wrote in the tenth century. His notice is perhaps derived from Ananiah of Shirak, an Armenian computist who lived in the eighth century, and survived as late as 828, when he drew up for his countrymen a calendar embracing a cycle of 532 years and extending to the year 1360. Ananiah's words are these:

* „After whom (Constantine the Great or Anatolius) also in the days of Constantius son of Constantine, Andreas, brother of the bishop Magnus, arranged a calendar of 200 years. Though this also was not free from ambiguity. So at the close of the calendar of Andreas of 200 years, in the days of king Justinian, a great enquiry was set afoot by skilled philosophers“ etc.

And in an Armenian summary of chronology compiled by a Monophysite and carried up to the year 686, found in an uncial ms. of Mush of the date A. D. 981, we find under the reign of Constantius this notice:

„In his days Andreas brother of Magnus the bishop drew up (or contrived) the mutual adjustment (or intertwining) of calendars.“

Samuel of Ani states that the biennial paschal canon of Andreas came into operation in the first year of Olympiad 283, in the year of the nativity 354.

In a colophon given in this Mush ms. of 981, and apparently copied from the author's exemplar, we read thus: „I David, a priest,

was enamoured of the luminous and divine teaching of S. Athanas against Arians and Jews concerning the economy of the divine word. . . . And, as in my humility and poverty of mind I was able, I made a summary, taking a few particulars also from the lore of the holy Andrew and from others like him; and I put together the calendars of these and collected them in this book, as a memorial of myself" etc.

I have not seen the Mush codex itself of the year 980, but only a transcript of portions of it made by a Mechitarist father, Ephrem Sethean, in the year 1836. The summary of chronology, above mentioned, is among the portion transcribed, but whether it is the summary described in the colophon is doubtful, for it contains nothing out of Athanasius *De Incarnatione*, and very little out of the Paschal chronicle for the period 41 B. C. to 354 A. D. Its main sources for this period were the old Armenian versions of Eusebius History and Chronicle. It is possible however that the lengths of the emperors reigns may have been taken from the Paschal Chronicle.

There remains then on the one hand the fact attested by Holstein, Bigot and Ducange, that there was an *editio prior* of the Paschal Chronicle which extended only as far the year 354 found in a ms. brought from Constantinople by way of Messina to Rome by the Abbé de Farina.¹⁾ On the other hand, there is the fact that Andreas drew up a Paschalion in that very year for Constantius. But the Armenian sources do not make it quite clear whether the work of Andreas was an extended chronicle, or a mere *computus*, like that of Hippolytus. The work of Andreas certainly included canons, for the fifth of these is cited by Armenian authors.

One other fact favours the identification of the Paschal chronicle with the lost work of Andreas. It is the panegyric of the Arian emperor Constantius on page 291 D of the former: *ἐν πᾶσι δὲ τούτοις ἦν ὁ θεὸς μετὰ Κωνσταντίου, εὐδοῶν αὐτοῦ τὴν βασιλείαν· ἦν γὰρ καὶ αὐτὸς πολλὴν φροντίδα ποιούμενος ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ.*

Such a panegyric can only have been written by a contemporary Arian, and is exactly what we should expect to find in a Paschalion written at the request of Constantius. Now the Armenian sources expressly allege that Andreas wrote his Paschalion by order of Constantius. Magnus the bishop is mentioned by Socrates Hist. p. 208.

But, it may be objected in the first place, the common document used in the Armenian history of Moses extended up to the death of

1) This was between the years 1635 and 1661. The existing Vatican ms of the Paschal Chronicle came to Rome from Messina about the year 1551.

Theodosius at Milan in the year 394; the work of Andreas only to A. D. 354.

This is true, but it does not run counter, either to the fact that the *editio prior* of the Chron Pasch. extended only as far as the year 354; or to the hypothesis that the chronicon is the very Paschalion, which from Armenian sources we know to have been drawn up in the year 354. All it proves is that the chronicle in question was continued in a second edition up to the year 394, or even to a later date. In every generation older chronicles were taken and brought up to date, and the last date up to which the Chronicle begun in 354 was brought, was, as we know from the Vatican ms. of it, the close of the reign of Heraclius.

And, in the second place, it may be objected that the arguments of the above pages based on a comparison of the Armenian text of Moses, jointly with Malalas and with the Chron. Pasch., went to prove that both the latter used a common source, which before the year 354 as after it contained some things absent from the Chron. Pasch., but given in Malalas; and contained other things absent in Malalas, but given in the Chron. Pasch.

It is, I think, a sufficient answer to this objection, that the codex of Holstein, even though it was much older in form than the existing codices, may yet have curtailed in some ways the original text, and may have contained lacunae. It certainly had one great lacuna in common with existing mss., at p. 233 of Ducange's edition. And further, the common document revealed in the Armenian document was certainly not the same as the *editio prior* of the Paschal Chronicle, but a continuation of it which ran up to A. D. 394. Such a continuation may have omitted some things from, while it added others to, the primitive fabric of the Paschalion of the year 354.

Oxford.

F. C. Conybeare.